UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/753,726	01/03/2001	Atsushi Okada	1232-4671	3777

7590   02/13/2003

MORGAN & FINNEGAN, L.L.P.
345 Park Avenue
New York, NY 10154

EXAMINER
NGUYEN, TAM V

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2172	

DATE MAILED: 02/13/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 07-01)

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ . Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>03 January 2001</u> .

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL.**   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
   closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-43* is/are pending in the application.

   4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-43* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

   Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

   If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

   a)☒ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

   1.☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

   2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

   3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
       application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
   * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

   a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .   6)☐ Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

1.   Claims 1-43 are pending in this office action. Claims 1-43 are presented for

examination. This office action is in response to the filing dated 01/03/01.

Priority

2.   Receipt is acknowledged papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d),

Paper No. 6 have been placed of record in the file.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for

all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described
> as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to
> be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been
> obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which
> said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the
> invention was made.

4.   Claims 1-17 and 19-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Inglett (US 5905990) in view of Kanno (US 6493713B1).

With respect to claim 1, Inglett discloses an automatic manhour setting

system for giving manhour data to work standard data converted into computer

data, comprising: a standard manhour database designed to be readable, in

which a number of pairs each constituted by a work standard described by a

standardized standard expression and manhour corresponding to the work

standard are registered in advance, (col. 6, lines 9-55); and manhour file means

for storing a set manhour file, (col. 6, lines 9-55)

Inglett does not clearly show, "Setting means for, for each of target work

standards to which manhours are to be given, matching an expression of the

target work standard with the standard expressions of the work standards in said

standard manhour database and setting a standard manhour of a matching work

standard in said database as a manhour of the target work standard

However, Kanno teaches setting means for, for each of target work

standards to which manhours are to be given, matching an expression of the

target work standard with the standard expressions of the work standards in said

standard manhour database and setting a standard manhour of a matching work

standard in said database as a manhour of the target work standard, (col. 10,

lines 4-56).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the

time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Inglett with the teaching

of Kanno because the matching between the retrieval condition character string

and the retrieval documents whenever a question takes place to bring the

retrieval result, so that there is no need to previously prepare an index for the

retrieval, thus saving the storage capacity and allowing the retrieval under

complicated requirement, (col. 1, lines 60-68).

As to claims 2 and 20, Inglett further discloses the system according to claim

1, wherein the target work standard to which the manhour is to be given is

described by an operation phrase representing an operation of a work, an

objection phrase representing a target of the operation, and a comment phrase

representing auxiliary information related to the operation and/or object, and

each of the work standards in said database is also described by an operation phrase, object phrase, and comment phrase, (col. 6, lines 9-55).

As to claims 3 and 21, Inglett further discloses the system according to claim 1, wherein for the target work standard to which the manhour is to be given, a first comment related to an object of an operation, an object phrase representing the object of the operation, a second comment related to the operation, and an operation phrase representing the operation of the work are described in a predetermined order, and for each of the work standards in said database, a first comment, object phrase, second comment, and operation phrase are also described in the predetermined order, (col. 6, lines 9-55).

As to claims 4 and 22, Inglett further discloses the system according to claim 1, wherein said setting means preferentially executes search based on complete matching between the expression of the target work standard and the standard expression of the work standard in said standard manhour database, (col. 6, lines 9-55).

As to claims 5 and 23, Inglett further discloses the system according to claim 4, wherein said setting means uses search based on partial matching for the target work standard for which the search based on complete matching to the standard expression of the work standard in said standard manhour database fails, (col. 10, lines 7-50).

As to claims 6 and 24, Inglett further discloses the system according to claim 4, wherein, when the search of the expression of the target work standard in said standard manhour database fails, said setting means executes search in a second manhour database whose degree of standardization is lower than that of said standard manhour database, (col. 6, lines 9-55).

As to claims 7 and 25, Inglett further discloses the system according to claim 5, wherein the expression included in the target work standard includes an expression by a wild card, (col. 6, lines 9-55).

As to claims 8 and 26, Inglett further discloses the system according to claim 7, wherein, when a plurality of standard work standards which match a work standard including an expression including a wild card symbol are present, candidates are displayed in a descending order of the degrees of matching to cause the user to select any one of the candidates, (col. 6, lines 9-55).

As to claims 9 and 27, Inglett further discloses the system according to claim 1, wherein standard manhour data in said standard manhour database contains a manhour value and data related to a set condition when the manhour value is set, (col. 10, lines 16-50).

As to claims 10 and 28, Inglett further discloses the system according to claim 9, wherein the condition data is referred to by a directory in a memory space of said automatic manhour setting system, and said setting means sets a directory value of the searched set condition data of the work standard as the manhour of the target work standard, (col. 10, lines 16-50).

As to claims 11 and 29, Inglett further discloses the system according to claim 6, further comprising analysis means for analyzing the work standard to assign the manhour when no matching is obtained by searching the second manhour database, (col. 6, lines 9-55).

As to claims 12 and 30, Inglett further discloses the system according to claim 6, further comprising analysis means for analyzing the work standard to assign the manhour when no matching is obtained by searching said standard manhour database, (col. 6, lines 9-55).

As to claims 13 and 31, Inglett further discloses the system according to claim 11, wherein said analysis means uses a creation tool with the same reference as that in creating contents of said standard manhour database, (col. 9,lines 65-col. 10,lines 16).

As to claims 14 and 32, Inglett further discloses the system according to claim 12, wherein said analysis means uses a creation tool with the same

reference as that in creating contents of said second manhour database, (col. 9, lines 65-col. 10, lines 16).

As to claims 15 and 33, Inglett further discloses the system according to claim 1, wherein further comprising download means for downloading a plurality of work standard data to which manhours are to be given, (col. 9, lines 65-col. 7, lines 16).

As to claims 16 and 34, Inglett further discloses the system according to claim 1, wherein the plurality of downloadable work standard are stored in an external database, and said download means comprises means for downloading directories of the downloadable work standards from the external database and displaying the directories, and selection means for selecting an arbitrary one of the displayed directories, thereby selecting the target work standard to which the manhour is to be given, (col. 11, lines 8-30).

As to claims 17 and 35, Inglett further discloses the system according to claim 16, wherein the external database stores the downloadable work standards having a hierarchical structure according to the degree of assembly, said download means downloads upper directories to said manhour setting system together with the directories of the downloadable work standards, said display means displays the downloaded work standard directories and upper directories

together, and said selection means can designate to select whether one of the displayed work standard directories or upper directories, (col. 11, lines 8-30).

As to claim 36, the method according to claim 35, wherein the hierarchical structure according to the degree of assembly is formed by putting the plurality of work standards together into an upper work group and giving a group identifier to each of the groups put together.

As to claim 37, Inglett further discloses the method according to claim 36, wherein the work group is classified into one of a component group formed from a plurality of work standards, a model group formed from a plurality of components, and a genre group formed from a plurality of models, (col. 12, lines 15-53).

As to claim 38, Inglett further discloses the method according to claim 19, wherein the manhour file has, for each work standard, a field where a log of addition and correction related to the manhour is recorded, (col. 6, lines 9-55).

As to claim 39, Inglett further discloses the system according to claim 1, wherein the manhour file has, for each work standard, a field where a log of addition and correction related to the manhour is recorded, (col. 6, lines 9-55).

As to claim 40, Inglett further discloses the system according to claim 39, further comprising means for referring to the log field, (col. 6, lines 9-55).

As to claim 41, Inglett further discloses a computer program storage medium which stores program codes of said automatic manhour setting method to realize said automatic manhour setting method of claim 19 by a computer system, (col. 6, lines 9-55).

As to claim 42, Inglett further discloses the system according to claim 2, wherein for the target work standard to which the manhour is to be given, a first comment related to an object of an operation, an object phrase representing the object of the operation, a second comment related to the operation, and an operation phrase representing the operation of the work are described in a predetermined order, and for each of the work standards in said database, a first comment, object phrase, second comment, and operation phrase are also described in the predetermined order, (col. 6, lines 9-55).

As to claim 43, Inglett further discloses the method according to claim 20, wherein for the target work standard to which the manhour is to be given, a first comment related to an object of an operation, an object phrase representing the object of the operation, a second comment related to the operation, and an operation phrase representing the operation of the work are described in a predetermined order, and for each of the work standards in the database, a first

comment, object phrase, second comment, and operation phrase are also described in the predetermined order, (col. 6, lines 9-55).

5.   Claim 18 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Inglett (US 5905990) in view of Kanno (US 6493713B1) further in view of Sullivan et al. (US 6477531B1).

As to claim 18, Inglett and Kanno do not teach, "A server including said manhour setting system of claim 1; and a plurality of the target work standard and the standard expression of the work ˛standard in the standard manhour database is executed."

However, Sullivan a server including said manhour setting system of claim 1, (col. 5, lines 55-68); and a plurality of the target work standard and the standard expression of the work standard in the standard manhour database is executed, (col. 5, lines 55-68).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Inglett with the teaching Kanno and the teaching of Sullivan because the system preferably refines its suggestions as more data and information is gathered from either the user, the user's system, or from a content database.

Conclusion

6.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Kucera (US 4674066) shows textual database system using skeletoniztion and phonetic replacement to retrieve words matching or similar to query words.

Strauss, Jr. et al. (US 5727196) shows optimized query interface for database management systems.

Guha (US 5895465) shows heuristic co-identification of objects across heterogeneous information sources.

Frisina (US 6385621B1) shows computer software for maintenance resource management.

Contact Information

7.   **Any response to this action should be mailed to:**

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tam V Nguyen whose telephone number is (703) 305-3735. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30AM-5: 00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kim Yen Vu can be reached on (703) 305-4393. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 746-7239 for formal communications and (703) 746-7240 for informal communications.

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, Virginia 22202. Fourth Floor (Receptionist).

8.   Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

TV:tv

02/05/03

SHAHID AL ALAM
PATENT EXAMINER